Attorney Docket No. AGIL-00501

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

2) Remarks/Arguments:

Status of Application

NOV 0 2 2006

Applicants wish to thank Examiner for his proposed changes, and have amended the claims per Examiner's Fax received 8/31/2006. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and objects set forth in the Office Action mailed 7/27/2006.

Examiner has acknowledged drawings received on 5/08/06.

Claims 7, 13, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneck et al. [USP 6,314,409 B2]

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatenable over Schneck et al. (USP 6,314409 B2) in view of Sadovsky (USP 5,689,638).

Claims 7, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck et al. (USP 6,314,409 B2) in view of Hayes et al. (WO 95/14266) and further in view of Sadovsky (USP 5,689,638)

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck et al. (USP 6,314,409 B2) and Sadovsky (USP 5,689,638) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Mukherjee et al. (USP 5,317,729).

Claim 1-6 and Claims 8-16 have been cancelled.

Claims 17-29 have been added.

Therefore, claims 7, and 17-29 are pending in the Application.

Claims

Claims 7, 13, and 15

Claims 7, 13, and 15 have been rejected 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections by modifying Claim 7 as per Examiner's suggestions, and further by canceling Claims 13 and 15.

Claim 14

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneck. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections by canceling Claim 14.

PAGE 10/11

Claims 1-5

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schneck* in view of *Sadovsky*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections by canceling Claims 1-5.

Claims 7, 13, and 15

Claims 7, 13, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schneck* in view of *Hayes* and further in view of *Sadovsky*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections by modifying Claim 7 as per Examiner's suggestions, and by further canceling Claims 13 and 15.

Claim 6

Claim 6 is rejected under claim 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck and Sadovsky as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Mukherjee. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections by canceling Claim 6.

New Claims

Applicant has added claims 17-29, which are system and apparatus claims directed to the method of claim 7. Applicant has added no new matter. Support for claims 17-20 are originally presented claims 2-5. Support for claims 22-24 may be found in the Specification at FIG. 4 and ¶¶ 0042-0046. Claims 25-29 are apparatus claims having substantially the same limitations as claim 7 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as presented for claim 7.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Attorney Docket No. AGIL-00501

NUV 0 2 2006

Conclusion

Applicant has amended the claims to further clarify features that are not described or suggested by the references. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the claims. In view of the discussion herein, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this applicant from the Examiner.

A one-month extension is hereby requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees to process this Amendment, or credit any over-payments that may apply, to Deposit Account No. 50-2421.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, please contact the undersigned at 408-288-5068.

Sincerely,

Dated: November 2, 2006

Damor K.I. Kali Reg. No. 50,541

Stevens Law Group P.O. Box 1667 San Jose, CA 95109 Tel (408) 288-5068 Fax (408) 288-7542